

**REMARKS**

This is in response to the Final Office Action dated August 22, 2005. The Examiner has rejected Claims 34-55. Claim 45-46 are canceled. Claims 34, 41, and 47 are amended. Claims 34-44 and 47-55 are pending.

Claims 45-46 have limitations different than those of the other claims. Applicant therefore requests that claims 45-46 be cancelled without prejudice in order to reduce the number of issues for consideration and to place the claims into better condition for appeal.

Claims 34-42, 44, 45, 47-49, and 51-55 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over BROKENSHIRE in view of CLOUTIER. Claims 43, 46, and 50 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over BROKENSHIRE and CLOUTER further in view of GOSSET.

Claims 34, 41, and 47 were amended to clarify elements in the previously presented claims which the Examiner has apparently not fully considered. On page 3 of the Final Office Action the Examiner refers to CLOUTIER disclosing "gamma correction for selected primitives." However, selected primitives types are different than selected primitives. It is inherent in the previously presented claims that gamma correction of coverage values is not performed for primitive types that are not selected. Applicant has therefore amended claims 34, 41, 47 to clarify that primitive types that do not belong to the selected class of primitive types do not have gamma correction of coverage values. Entry of the amendment and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Applicant's claimed invention permits greater control over gamma correction than taught or suggested by the cited art. The capability to select a class of primitives types for which gamma correction of coverage values is performed thus provides a new capability to achieve gamma correction that reduces visual artifacts. In particular, Applicant's claimed invention permits different types of primitives to be independently enabled for gamma correction of coverage values. Thus, a selection can be made regarding which types of primitives for which gamma correction of coverage values is performed.

Optimizing the appearance of edges in a graphics system depends on many factors. In particular, aliasing effects generate visual artifacts which, in some cases, may be more pronounced for different types of primitives, such as lines, stippled lines, circles, and polygons. For example, lines, stippled lines, and polygons may tend to be oriented at different angles in an

application or have a different contrast, color, or brightness with respect to the background. Consequently, in some applications it may be desirable to enable gamma correction of coverage values of one type of primitive but disable it for another. For example, for one application, it may be desirable to enable gamma correction for coverage values of polygons but to disable it for lines. However, for another application, it may be desirable to enable gamma correction of coverage values of lines but to disable it for polygons.

Applicant respectfully submits that the prior art of record does not teach or suggest the limitations of claim 34 (and corresponding limitations of claims 41 and 47) of: “for each pixel partially covered by a primitive of a primitive type belonging to said selected class of primitive types, gamma correcting its coverage value to form at least one gamma corrected coverage value” and “for each pixel partially covered by a primitive of a primitive type not belonging to said selected class of primitive types, not gamma correcting its coverage value.” BROKENSHERE and CLOUTIER do not teach or suggest independently enabling gamma correction of coverage values of different types of primitives based on primitive type. BROKENSHERE discloses gamma correction of lines and only mentions in passing in paragraph [0008] applying the same technique to other types of primitives. CLOUTIER discloses monitor calibration but does not teach or suggest selectively enabling gamma correction based on primitive type. Consequently, Applicant respectfully submits that BROKENSHERE and CLOUTIER do not teach or suggest all of the elements of Applicant’s claimed invention. Applicant notes that GOSSET was cited only for dependent claims having blending limitations.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned if there are any residual issues that can be resolved through a telephone call.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees to Deposit Account No. 03-3117.

Dated: October 24, 2005

COOLEY GODWARD LLP  
ATTN: Patent Group  
Five Palo Alto Square  
3000 El Camino Real  
Palo Alto, CA 94306-2155  
Tel: (650) 843-5000  
Fax: (650) 857-0663

Respectfully submitted,  
COOLEY GODWARD LLP

By:



---

Ed Van Gieson  
Reg. No. 44,386